

Degree Program Name: __ Undergraduate Degrees in Music __ **Contact Name and Email** Scott.Buchanan@indstate.edu & Terry.Dean@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>1a. Students will synthesize an understanding of musical concepts and structures through the creation and realization of music.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Evaluation final sight singing exam</p> <p>(MUS 213)</p>	<p>Students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Sight Singing Skills Rubric.</p>	<p>Student artifacts were not made available to the Assessment Committee and this point of assessment failed for the 2016-17 AY.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results.</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2017 faculty retreat.</p>
<p>1b. Students will synthesize an understanding of musical concepts and structures through the creation and realization of music.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Scoring of final dictation exam</p> <p>(MUS 213)</p>	<p>Students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Dictations Skills Rubric.</p>	<p>Student artifacts were not made available to the Assessment Committee and this point of assessment failed for the 2016-17 AY.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results.</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2017 faculty retreat.</p>
<p>1c. Students will synthesize an understanding of musical concepts and structures through the creation and realization of music.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Evaluation of Composition Project</p> <p>(MUS 211)</p>	<p>Students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Music Composition Skills Rubric.</p>	<p>Student artifacts were not made available to the Assessment Committee and this point of assessment failed for the 2016-17 AY.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results.</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2017 faculty retreat.</p>

<p>1d. Students will synthesize an understanding of musical concepts and structures through the creation and realization of music.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Piano Proficiency Evaluations (Degree requirement; Not tied to an individual course)</p>	<p>Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Piano Proficiency Rubric for their degree program.</p>	<p>Altogether, 70.4% ($n=27$) met or exceeded the benchmark.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results.</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2017 faculty retreat.</p>
<p>2. Students will combine theoretical knowledge with practical workplace applications to develop into music industry professionals prepared to quickly assess the needs of a position and a company, then to be a positive, effective, creative and professional asset to the company and to the overall music industry.</p> <p>(Music Business concentrations)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of final portfolio comprised of biweekly reports which address how theory has been applied to the workplace in a positive, effective and creative manner (MUS 499)</p>	<p>Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Music Business Internship Rubric.</p>	<p>Altogether, 100% ($n=3$) of students met or exceeded the benchmark.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results.</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2017 faculty retreat</p>
<p>3. Students will demonstrate through practical field experience and written documents, such as unit and lesson plans, their ability to plan and deliver pedagogically competent and developmentally appropriate music instruction in a variety of music classrooms.</p> <p>(Music Education concentrations)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of weekly portfolio entries and final self-evaluation. (MUS 495)</p>	<p>Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Music Education Student Teaching Experience Rubric.</p>	<p>A random sample of student portfolios were assessed ($n=5$), 80% met or exceeded the benchmark.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results.</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2017 faculty retreat.</p>

<p>4. Students will present a recital of compositions in a variety of media, styles and forms that the faculty jury panel determines would reasonably be deemed worthy of acceptance into a master's degree program in music composition at a peer institution.</p> <p>(Music Composition concentration)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of a digital audio recording of the senior composition recital.</p> <p>(MUS 479)</p>	<p>Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Composition Recital Assessment Rubric.</p>	<p>No music composition students scheduled recitals for the 201617 AY and this point of assessment failed.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results.</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2017 faculty retreat.</p>
<p>5. Students will complete an Exit Survey upon completion of their undergraduate degree program.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Exit survey issued to all graduating and recently graduated students.</p>	<p>It was expected that students would provide an honest reflection of their time in the ISU School of Music</p>	<p>Students were quite open with their responses...identifying both successes and points of concern.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results.</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2017 faculty retreat.</p>

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark."
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., "85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

In 2016-17, the School of Music completed assessment of five learning outcomes, including undergraduate performance juries, writing and analysis in the theory curriculum, music technology projects, music composition recitals, and senior performance recitals. Faculty members expect 100% of students to earn the rating of at least “Meets Expectations.” As the chart above shows, this benchmark was not met for most outcomes.

Outcome 1a: This learning outcome was not assessed as the teacher of record for this course did not submit artifacts, despite frequent requests for such.

Outcome 1b: This learning outcome was not assessed as the teacher of record for this course did not submit artifacts, despite frequent requests for such.

Outcome 1c: The School of Music Director has recommended that all academic courses with written documents associated with the assessment of learning outcomes will be communicated in course syllabi and assignments/projects submitted via TurnItIn in BlackBoard. This will help guarantee that artifacts are available to the Assessment Committee as needed.

Outcome 1d: As a group, the majority of students achieved the benchmark for this learning outcome. Data indicate, however, that students did not meet expectations (or only marginally so) in two subsections of the piano proficiency. On average, students do not meet expectations for the benchmark related to keyboard harmonization. To address this issue, keyboard faculty will work with music theory faculty to address issues of consistency with regard to how harmonization is taught across the curriculum, which will help eliminate inconsistencies. Additionally, on average, students only marginally meet expectations related to sight-reading. After considering the data available, keyboard faculty identified that sight-reading items on the exam are significantly more difficult than those studied in piano class. These items will be revised for future exams. Moreover, recent increases in the number of students in sections of class piano courses have likely had a negative impact on student success. Therefore, piano faculty will explore ways to increase one-on-one interaction with students through such means as smaller class sizes, or greater graduate student assistance.

Outcome 2: Only three sets of artifacts were available for the assessment of this learning outcome. All students achieved the benchmark, which is expected as students are not approved for internship placement until the Coordinator of the Music Business program is certain they are ready and will be successful.

Outcome 3: As a group, this random selection of student portfolios achieved the benchmark for this learning outcome. Data indicate that our preservice music educators excel in professional behavior and educational philosophy, but more work needs to be done to address musical aptitude and disposition. We are recommending that the rubrics be shared with the students and reviewed with both the host teacher and the university supervisor during the student teaching placement/portfolio work.

Outcome 4: No music composition students scheduled recitals during the 2015-16 academic year. This point of assessment will be revisited during the 2016-17 academic year.

Outcome 5: The qualitative data from the Exit Survey yielded a variety of responses to the items. Student shared concerns in areas of advising, facilities, and the overall organization within the School of Music. These concerns will be addressed at the Fall Faculty Retreat and, hopefully, we can do a better job of serving our students. Due to a variety of factors, the advisement in the School of Music lacks consistency. This will be addressed through re-assignment, which should provide an overall better balance among faculty advisors. The School of Music is currently going through a period of transition, in terms of administration. Once things have settled down, there should be greater consistency and organization with the unit.

During the 2017-18 academic year, the School of Music is not scheduled to revisit any of the learning outcomes identified above. Due to the absence of artifacts for assessment, the School of Music will revisit Learning Outcomes 1a-c. Moreover, Learning Outcome 4 will be revisited when next a music composition student schedules a recital.

For each of the assessments outlined above, the 2017-18 year will serve to establish a baseline against which future assessment will be analyzed. As such, rubrics and assessment processes are still in the developmental stage and will be finalized during the Fall 2017 semester.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BA in Music Date: 10.18.17

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ? <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were

<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate. <i>Seems low to me.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p>assessed in this cycle.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students</p>
---	--	--	--	--

				<p>know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<p>3. Results</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
<p>4. Engagement & Improvement</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <i>Plan to be.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p>

	about previous results or plans.	connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS:

As you note, it has been a year of transition and change for the department. For that reason, the undergraduate program was not able to complete its assessments, which is one of the key concerns I identified in last year’s report. You *have* made plans to take action to address some weaknesses that assessment has revealed. Thank you—I hope the program is able to follow through and report on specific results and improvements next year. The fifth outcome, newly designed to ensure you have an indirect measure, needs to be rewritten. What do you want students to demonstrate by completing the survey— that they believe they are achieving stated learning outcomes or are satisfied with the program? If the former, this may not be a separate outcome at all but a measure for the other outcomes (and students would offer their perceptions as to whether they could create music, for example). If the latter, then perhaps the outcome could say something like, “Students will recommend the program to others.” In either case, you should set a real performance standard (“Students will rate their satisfaction as at least a 3 on a 5-point scale”) and be more explicit about the results. Regarding the performance targets, I still think 70% is low, but right now there is too little data to be certain. Last, I await an updated outcomes library and curriculum map.

The rubric attached to your Student Learning Summary Report identifies specific items the assessment committee will need to address to move closer to the “mature” realm. The key, of course, is to present complete data, analyses that reveal precisely what students know and can do (and don’t know, can’t do), appropriate plans for intervention, and results that show improvements in learning.

You also should know that because we are gearing up for the Higher Learning Commission (which will visit ISU in 2020 or 2021 as part of the accreditation reaffirmation process), it is particularly important for us to be able to provide evidence that we are systematically assessing our curricular and co-curricular programs; using the information we derive from that process to develop actionable plans for improvement in student learning; and documenting the improvements that result. Thus, it is even more important that in Part Two of your 2018 Student Learning Summary Report, you describe your program's efforts to comply with these expectations.

Finally you should be aware that by fall 2018, all undergraduate programs are expected to be assessing students' career readiness. You may already have a learning outcome or measure that addresses this goal. In any case, your next Student Learning Summary Plan should reference your efforts to assess career readiness, either in Part One (if you have data to report) or Part Two (if you have developed a plan to assess career readiness that you will report on in 2019).